NOTES ON SOME CULTIVATED TREES AND SHRUBS, V

Alfred Rehder

Chamaecyparis obtusa f. **Sanderi** (Sander), comb. nov.

Juniperus Sanderi Sander ex Masters in Gard. Chron. ser. 3, **25**: 287 (1889), nom. subnud. — Beissner in Mitt. Deutsch. Dendr. Ges. **1899**(8): 116 (1899), pro syn. — Unger in Mitt. Deutsch. Dendr. Ges. **1900**(9): 69 (1900), pro syn. — Anon. in Möller's Deutsch. Gärtn.-Zeit. **15**: 589, fig. (1900), nom. subnud.; cf. p. 246, 428.

Chamaecyparis obtusa ericoides hort. Jap. ex Boehmer, Cat. **1899–1900** (suppl.): 2 (1899), nom. nud. — Beissner in Mitt. Deutsch. Dendr. Ges. **1901**(10): 77 (1901), nom. subnud.; **1903**(12): 51 (1903, Dec.); in Möller's Deutsch. Gärtn.-Zeit. **18**: 291, fig. (1903, June 20); Handb. Nadelh. ed. 2, 556, fig. 142 (1909). — Hornibrook, Dwarf Conif. 41, fig. (1923) "var." — Rehder in Bailey, Cult. Evergr. 216, fig. 41 (1923). — Non *Retinispora obtusa* var. *ericoides* Hoopes (1868).

Retinispora Sanderi (Hort.) Sander in Gard. Chron. ser. 3, **33**: 266, fig. 111 (1903); no. 852 (Suppl.), fig. 107 (p. ii) (1903, April 25), nom. subnud.

Cupressus pisifera var. *Sanderi* Dallimore & Jackson, Handb. Conif. 219 (1923), nom. tentat.

Juniperus sabina Ungeri Anon. in Gartenwelt, **33**: 290, fig. (1929).

Juniperus sabina Sanderi Anon. in op. cit. 291 (1929), pro syn.

This juvenile form has been listed by most recent authors as *Chamaecyparis obtusa ericoides* Boehmer, a nomen nudum first validated in 1909 by Beissner (l.c.). This name, however, should be considered a later homonym of *Retinispora obtusa* var. *ericoides* Hoopes (1868), since *Retinispora obtusa* Sieb. & Zucc. and *C. obtusa* Endl. are synonymous. *Retinispora obtusa* var. *ericoides* Hoopes is based chiefly on *Chamaecyparis ericoides* Carr. (1855); there can, however, be no doubt that *C. ericoides* Carr. does not belong to *C. obtusa*, but represents a juvenile form of *C. pisifera*, namely *C. pisifera* f. *squarrosa* [Zucc.] Beiss. and partly *C. thyoides* f. *ericoides* (Carr.) Rehd. As the epithet *ericoides* has been applied to forms under three different species in the genus *Chamaecyparis*, and may therefore cause confusion, its rejection in favor of *Sanderi*, about which there can be no doubt as to the plant meant by it, is in accordance with the spirit of the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature (see Art. 4), even if *Retinispora obtusa* var. *ericoides* Hoopes and *Chamaecyparis obtusa* var. *ericoides* Beissner are not homonyms in the strict sense of the word; moreover, the first two figures of this plant were published under the names *Juniperus Sanderi* and *Retinispora Sanderi*.

In the note in Gard. Chron. ser. 3, **25**: 287 (1899) on *Juniperus Sanderi*, it is stated that *J. Sanderi*, a Japanese species, was introduced by F. Sander & Co., about 1896, but I have not been able to verify this statement.

Carya sect. I. **Pacania** (Raf.), comb. nov.
Hicoria subgen. *Pacania* Rafinesque, Alsogr. Am. 65 (1838).
Hicoria subgen. *Drimocarya* Rafinesque, l.c. (1838), p.p.
Carya sect. II. *Apocarya* C. de Candolle in De Candolle, Prodr. 16,2: 144 (1864).
Hicoria sect. *Apohicoria* Dippel, Handb. Laubh. 2: 336 (1892).
Hicoria [sect.]. *Apocarya* Sargent, Silva N. Am. 7: 135 (1895).

The oldest subdivisional name for this section has been generally overlooked, but as it was validly published with a description and reference to the species belonging to it, it must replace the name *Apocarya* C. de Candolle. For the second group, I have retained the name *Eucarya* C. de Candolle, since its circumscription agrees exactly with that adopted here, while it seems doubtful which of the names of the three subgenera into which this group was split by Rafinesque should have preference.

×**Malus purpurea** (Barbier) Rehder f. **pendula** (Bean) Rehder, comb. nov.
×*Pyrus purpurea* var. *pendula* Bean, Trees Shrubs Brit. Isl. 3: 327 (1933).

This is a pendulous form of × *M. purpurea* (Barbier) Rehder (in Jour. Arnold Arb. 2: 57. 1920), a hybrid between × *M. atrosanguinea* [*M. Halliana* Koehne × *Sieboldii* (Regel) Rehder] and *M. pumila* var. *Niedzwetzkyana* (Dieck) Schneider. No mention is made by Bean, who published the first reference to it, when and where this form originated.

Rhododendron macrophyllum G. Don f. **album**, f. nova.

A typo recedit flore albo.

OREGON: Junction City, Lane Co. *J. E. Barto*, May 3, 1930 (in herb. Arnold Arb.).

The specimen collected by J. E. Barto bears on the label the varietal epithet *album* which agrees with the fact that its flowers are white even in bud. This is the only specimen with white flowers in the herbarium of the Arnold Arboretum and there is none at all in the Gray Herbarium; all other specimens collected in flower have the corolla more or less rose-colored to rose-carmine. In none of the floras of the West Coast is any mention made of a white-flowered form, although the original description of *R. macrophyllum* G. Don (Gen. Hist. Dichlam. Pl. 3: 843. 1834) says: "*corolla alba*"; only those later authors who keep *R. macrophyllum* and *R. californicum* as distinct species describe the flowers of the former as smaller and white. This separation is apparently only based on the color as given in G. Don's description. It appears, however, that G. Don was in error when he ascribed white flowers to this Rhododendron collected by Menzies at Port Townsend, for in his journal edited by C. F. Newcombe in 1923, under the title "Journal of Vancouver's Voyage, April to October, 1792" Menzies refers twice to this Rhododendron, on p. 20* as *R. ponticum* and on p. 49 as "that beautiful native of the Levant, the purple Rhododendron"; apparently he identified the Rhododendron of the Vancouver region which is in general appearance similar to *R. ponticum* L., with that species he knew from Europe and probably from plants cultivated in England, whence it was introduced in 1763 from Gibraltar. As there

* Called by the editor *R. californicum* in a marginal note.

occurs no other species of the subgenus *Eurhododendron* on the West Coast of North America but *R. macrophyllum* G. Don (*R. californicum* Hook.), the specimens collected by Menzies and compared by him with the purple flowered *R. ponticum* could not have been the apparently extremely rare white-flowered form; the explanation seems to be that the flowers of the specimens were faded and discolored and looked as if they might have been white, as they do in some of the more recently collected specimens before me.* Don also describes the filaments as glabrous, which they are not, not even in the white-flowered form; they are densly pubescent at least at the lower third. A specimen from the type-locality, Port Townsend, Jefferson Co., coll. J. Wm. Thompson, no. 10639, June 9, 1934, has pink flowers up to 6 cm. across and rather large leaves, 9–15 cm. long. Size and color of the flowers are not concomitant characters, nor have they any connection with the geographical distribution; a specimen from Monterey has one of the smallest flowers that I have seen, about 3 cm. across and they are pink.

Ligustrum sect. **Euligustrum**, nom. nov.

Ligustrum sect. III. *Baccatae* Mansfeld in Bot. Jahrb. 59, Beibl. 132: 42 (1924).

Decaisne was the first to subdivide the genus into groups of which he distinguished four without, however, giving names to his sections [in Fl. des Serres, 22: 4–11 (1877) and in Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, sér. 2, 2: 17–37 (Monog. Ligustrum Syringa.) (1879)]. Of the first of these sections characterized by "Flores hypocrateriformes" Koehne published in 1904 as sect. *Ibota* a monographic treatment in Festschr. 70 Geburtst. Ascherson, 189–208, 4 fig. (Abstract in Mitt. Deutsch. Dendr. Ges. 1904 (13): 68–76, 6 fig. [1905]). In 1924 Mansfeld divided the genus into three sections and the second section into two subsections, using for his section III, a form of name contrary to usage and, moreover, the adjectives in plural are treated as of feminine gender which is grammatically incorrect (see also my proposal of changes of Art. 26 of the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature in Jour. Arnold Arb. 20: 269. 1939). I propose, therefore, to change the name sect. *Baccatae* to sect. *Euligustrum*, since it contains the type-species of the genus.

Ligustrum vulgare f. **nanum** (Kohankie), grad. nov.

"Privet Lodense" (*Ligustrum nanum compactum*) Jackson & Perkins, Fall-Price-List, 1924: 15 (1924), cum descr.

Ligustrum lodense Glogau in Gartenwelt, 32: 658 (1928), nom. subnud. — Henry Kohankie & Son, Price List, Fall 1930: 54 (1930). — Rehder, Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, ed. 2, 784 (1940) "Lodense."

Ligustrum vulgare nanum Henry Kohankie & Son, Price List, 1945–46: 76 (1945), nom.

A typo speciei recedit habitu compacto nano, 0.75 m. vix excedente,

* Of an original specimen of *R. macrophyllum* collected by Menzies and preserved in the herbarium of the British Museum of Natural History, Mr. J. Ramsbottom kindly sent me a photograph recently taken by Dr. Bernice Schubert, and informed me that the flowers showed a uniform light brown color and might easily have been taken as having originally been white.

ramis erectis vel suberectis. Folia ovato-oblonga vel rarius anguste oblonga, 2–4 cm. longa et 0.6–1.5 cm. lata, obtusa vel acutiuscula, basi late cuneata vel cuneata.

CULTIVATED SPECIMENS: Arnold Arboretum, no. 710-37 (no. 18331) and no. 977-25, *A. Rehder*, Sept. 12 and Oct. 5, 1946.

This form of *Ligustrum vulgare* differs from the typical form in its dwarf and compact habit, with upright and ascending branches. It originated in the nursery of Henry Kohankie & Son at Painesville, Ohio, some time before 1924 and was first offered for sale in 1924 by Jackson & Perkins under the name "Privet Lodense" with the descriptive synonym *Ligustrum nanum compactum* added in parenthesis. The word "Lodense" does not represent, as seems to have been assumed by some, a Latin adjective, but is formed by contracting the two words "low" and "dense," descriptive of the habit of the plant; it is intended as the English or horticultural name of this plant and should not be considered a botanical epithet.

Ligustrum ovalifolium f. **aureum** (Carrière) Rehd., grad. nov.

Ligustrum ovalifolium aureum Carrière in Rev. Hort. **1862**: 314 (1862). — Bean, Trees Shrubs Brit. Isl. 2: 27 (1914) "var."

Ligustrum ovalifolium variegatum Bull ex T. Moore in Proc. Hort. Soc. Lond. 5: 138, 144 (1865).

?*Ligustrum japonicum* var. *tricolor* Jacob-Makoy, Cat. no. 114 (1870) ex E. Morren & C. de Vos, Index Bibliogr. Hort. Belg. 555 (1887), nom. — Meehan in Meehan's Monthly, 2: 42, fig. (1892) "tricolored"; nom. subnud.

Ligustrum californicum robustum variegatum Carrière in Rev. Hort. 1877: 352 (1877).

Ligustrum ovalifolium robustum aureo-marginatum hort. ex Dippel, Handb. Laubh. 1: 135 (1889).

Ligustrum californicum aureum hort. et *L. elegantissimum* hort. ex [Nicholson] Kew Hand-List Trees Shrubs, 2: 93 (1896), pro syn.

Ligustrum ovalifolium var. *aureo-marginatum* Hort. ex Rehder in Bailey, Cycl. Am. Hort. [2]: 913 (1900); Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, ed. 2, 786 (1940).

Ligustrum ovalifolium var. *robustum variegatum* Hort. ex Rehder, l.c. (1900), pro syn.

Ligustrum ovalifolium aureo-variegatum hort. ex Schelle in Beissner et al., Handb. Laubh.-Ben. 418 (1903), nom.

There can be but little doubt that all the names cited above belong to *Ligustrum ovalifolium* f. *aureum*, except perhaps the doubtful *L. japonicum* var. *tricolor* Jacob-Makoy, of which I have seen no specimen; certainly Meehan's figure of it does not represent a form of *L. japonicum* Thunb. which has coriaceous evergreen leaves and would not be hardy near Philadelphia. Moreover, the name *L. japonicum* has often been applied in garden and horticultural literature to *L. ovalifolium*.

Ligustrum Vicaryi (Beckett) (*L. ovalifolium* f. *aureum* × *L. vulgare*), hybrida nova.

Ligustrum Ibota aureum Vicarii E. Beckett in Aldenham House Garden Surpl. Pl. **1923**: 14 (1923); **1929**: 27 (1929), nom. subnud.

Ligustrum Ibota Vicaryi Lemoine, [Cat.] no. 198(1924–25): 11 (1924), nom. subnud. — Besant in Gard. Chron. ser. 3, **100**: 82 (1936) "var."

Frutex ramulis glabris. Folia elliptica vel ovato-elliptica, 2–4, rarius ad 6–7 cm. longa, acuta vel breviter acuminata, ad basin ramulorum

minora 1.5–2 cm. longa et interdum obtusiuscula, basi late cuneata, glabra, partim lutea, petiolis 2–4 mm. longis. Panicula 3–6 cm. longa, axi et ramulis sparse et minute puberulis; pedicello et calyce glabro; corolla tubo 3 mm. longo, longitudinem limbi dimidio excedente; staminibus limbum paullo excedentibus vel subaequilongis. Fructus subglobosus, 4 mm. diam.

CULTIVATED SPECIMENS: Arnold Arboretum, no. 332–36 (from New York Botanic Garden as *L. ciliatum Vicaryi*), *A. Rehder*, July 1 and October 5, 1946, (TYPE); no. 668–33 and 500–36 (from Boyce Thompson Inst., Yonkers, N. Y., as *L. ciliatum Vicaryi*), *E. J. Palmer*, July 5 and October 17, 1938; Hort. Vilmorin, Verrières, France, *Roger L. de Vilmorin*, 1927; Coolidge Coll., San Diego County, Calif., July 1919 and May, 1920, *F. G. W.* (as *Ligustrum* sp.).

This Ligustrum apparently originated some time before 1920 in the garden of Vicary Gibbs of Aldenham, Middlesex, England, famous for his collection of rare trees and shrubs. Its characters suggest a cross between *Ligustrum ovalifolium* f. *aureum* and *L. vulgare*. In its general appearance it resembles very much *L. ovalifolium* f. *aureum*, but the influence of *L. vulgare* is indicated by the more compact and smaller inflorescence with its axis and branchlets puberulous, and particularly by the shorter corolla-tube which is only about $1\frac{1}{2}$ times as long as the corolla-lobes, while in *L. ovalifolium* it is two to three times as long as the lobes, and in *L. vulgare* shorter than the lobes. The shape of the leaves is much like that of *L. ovalifolium*, but the variegation is more irregular than in its f. *aureum* and the leaves of the weaker branches are often entirely green. Since writing the preceding description proposing this plant as a hybrid of *L. vulgare* and *L. ovalifolium*, my attention has been drawn to a note by J. W. Besant in Gardeners' Chronicle (l.c.) in which he calls *L. Ibota* var. *Vicaryi* "a variant from the common and oval-leafed Privets" which apparently means a hybrid between *L. vulgare* and *L. ovalifolium*. It may be considered a confirmation of the correctness of calling this plant a hybrid between these two species, that the same explanation of its origin is based on two entirely different and independent sources. The fact that the pollen of this plant is normal can not be considered a proof against its hybrid origin, for pollen sterility, though prevalent in hybrids, cannot be considered an infallible character of hybridity, for there are hybrids with normal pollen, as × *Platanus acerifolia* (Ait.) Willd. (*P. occidentalis* × *orientalis*).

Ligustrum Tschonoskii Decne. var. **macrocarpum** (Koehne), comb. nov.

Ligustrum macrocarpum Koehne in Festschr. 70. Geburtst. Ascherson, 201, fig. 3, B (1904); in Mitteil. Deutsch. Dendr. Ges. **1904** (13): 76, fig. 6 [1905]; in Repert. Sp. Nov. Reg. Veg. **1**: 10 (1905).

Ligustrum medium hort. ex Koehne, op. cit. 203 (1904), pro syn.; non Franchet & Savatier [1878].

Ligustrum acuminatum var. *macrocarpum* Schneider, Ill. Handb. Laubh. 2: 807, fig. 508 l-n (1911).

Ligustrum ciliatum var. *macrocarpum* Mansfeld in Bot. Jahrb. 59, Beibl. 132: 68 (1924).

As *L. macrocarpum* is apparently not specifically different from *L. Tschonoskii*, the above new combination becomes necessary.

Vitex Negundo L. var. **heterophylla** (Franch.), comb. nov.

Vitex chinensis Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 8, *V.* no. 5 (1768). — Nakai, Fl. Sylv. Kor. 14: 38, t. 12 (1923).

Vitex incisa Lamarck, Encycl. Méth. Bot. 2: 612 [1788]. — Bunge in Mém. Div. Sav. Acad. Sci. St. Pétersb. 2: 126 (Enum. Pl. Chin.-Bor. 52. 1833) (1835). — Merrill in Lingnan Sci. Jour. 5: 158 (1927).

Vitex Negundo sensu Curtis in Bot. Mag. 11: t. 364 (1797), non Linnaeus (1753).

Vitex laciniatus Hort. ex Schauer in De Candolle, Prodr. 11: 684 (1847), pro syn.

Agnus castus incisa Carrière in Rev. Hort. 1870: 415 (1871).

Vitex incisa var. *heterophylla* Franchet in Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, sér. 2, 6: 112 (Pl. David. 1: 232. 1884) (1883). — Rehder in Sargent, Pl. Wilson. 3: 374 (1916), in obs.

Vitex Negundo var. *incisa* (Lam.) C. B. Clarke in Hooker f., Fl. Brit. Ind. 4: 584 (1885). — Rehder in Sargent, Pl. Wilson. 3: 373 (1916). — P'ei in Mem. Sci. Soc. China, 1,3: 106 (Verbenac. China.) (1932).

The above new combination was necessary since according to Art. 58 of the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature the oldest varietal name has to be used for the new ternary combination.

As I stated in the discussion under *Vitex Negundo* var. *incisa* (in Sargent, Pl. Wilson. 3: 374. 1916) Franchet's *V. incisa* var. *heterophylla* can hardly be separated as a distinct variety or form from *V. Negundo* var. *incisa* (Lam.) C. B. Clarke, and if united, Franchet's varietal name has priority over *V. Negundo* var. *incisa* (Lam.) C. B. Clarke.

Vitex Negundo var. **heterophylla** f. **multifida** (Carr.), comb. nov.

Agnus castus incisa var. *multifida* Carrière in Rev. Hort. 1870: 416 [1871].

Vitex incisa var. *multifida* Schneider, Ill. Handb. Laubh. 2: 594, fig. 384m-n (1911).

Vitex Negundo var. *incisa* f. *multifida* (Carr.) Rehder in Bailey, Stand. Cycl. Hort. 6: 3481, 3574 (1917) "*V. N.* f. *multifida*," p. 3574.

A form of *V. Negundo* var. *heterophylla* with deeply pinnatifid leaflets and narrow remote segments.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.